

## 11.0 ALTERNATIVES

In order to fully evaluate the environmental effects of proposed projects, CEQA mandates that alternatives to the proposed project be analyzed. Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project” and the evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. The alternatives discussion is intended to “focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project,” even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project alternatives.

Three alternative land use scenarios were developed as part of the outreach program for the General Plan Update. Each scenario identified possible land use changes in the three of the four planning areas of the General Plan area. After review of these scenarios, a Preferred Plan was developed and reviewed. All four of these land use plans were evaluated at an equivalent level of detail throughout this EIR. Four additional project alternatives in accordance with the requirements of CEQA were evaluated for this project. They include the No Project Alternative, the Reduced Project Alternative, the Community Character Alternative, and the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative. Each major issue area included in the detailed impact analysis of this EIR (Chapter 5) has been given consideration in the alternative analysis. A summary of all the major issue areas for each alternative is provided in Table 1-4 of the Executive Summary of this EIR.

As required under Section 15126.6 (e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR must identify the environmentally superior alternative. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, if the No Project Alternative is determined to be the most environmentally superior project, then another alternative among the alternatives evaluated must be identified as the environmentally superior project. The Reduced Project Alternative is the environmentally superior project because it would reduce impacts associated with land use, visual quality/landform alternation, traffic, air quality, noise, utilities and services, and water quality while implementing some of the project objectives. The project objectives are enumerated in Section 3.3 of this EIR.

### 11.1 No Project (Adopted General Plan) Alternative

The No Project alternative would continue to implement the adopted General Plan, which was adopted in 1989. The elements of the adopted General Plan are grouped into three main categories: Community Development, Environmental Resources Management, and Hazard Management. Each category reflects specific aspects of development policies. The analysis of the No Project Alternative can be found in Section 10, Plan to Plan – No Project Alternative, of this EIR.

## 11.2 Reduced Project Alternative

The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce development throughout the General Plan area compared to the Preferred Plan and each of the scenarios. The purpose of this alternative is to evaluate the potential for reducing traffic and traffic-related impacts, such as noise and air quality, and evaluating the potential for reducing the effects on land use and community character. It was developed by taking a combination of the least developed, highest park and open space components from the Preferred Plan and each of the scenarios for the areas that change. Table 11-1 presents the source scenarios used for developing the Reduced Project Alternative. For example, this table indicates that in the areas that change, the scenario with the least number of residential units planned for the Otay Ranch Subarea is Scenario 3, while the greatest amount of open space for the Montgomery Subarea is proposed in the Preferred Plan. The total acreage and number of residential units resulting from combining these elements is presented in Table 11-2. Where there was no difference between scenarios or where the Preferred Plan scenario represented the least developed condition, the Preferred Plan component was included in this alternative.

**TABLE 11-1  
SCENARIO FORMING THE BASIS FOR THE REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

	Subarea		
	Montgomery	Otay Ranch	Urban Core
Commercial	Scenario 2	Preferred	Preferred
Industrial	Preferred	Scenario 2	Preferred
Open space	Preferred	Scenario 1	Preferred
Park	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred
Public	Preferred	Scenario 3	Scenario 3
Residential	Scenario 1	Scenario 3	Scenario 2

**TABLE 11-2  
REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE TOTAL ACREAGE  
AND RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN UPDATE AREAS BY PRIMARY SUBAREA**

Type	Subarea		
	Montgomery	Otay Ranch	Urban Core
Commercial acres	163	369	299
Industrial acres	295	211	—
Open space acres	123	126	17
Park acres	54	385	20
Public acres	46	846	89
Residential units	7,679	8,805	15,664

Tables 11-3 and 11-4 show a comparison of land uses of the Reduced Project Alternative to each of the scenarios, the Preferred Plan and the adopted General Plan. These comparisons are illustrated in Charts 10-1 through 10-4. The Reduced Project Alternative would allow for a total of 32,148 residential units and 2,998 acres of commercial, industrial, and public uses. This alternative would allow for an increase of open space and park uses when compared to the Preferred Plan and each of the scenarios. The following discussion identifies issues that differentiate the Proposed Project with the Reduced Project Alternative.

**TABLE 11-3**  
**ACRES BY SCENARIO/ALTERNATIVE FOR THE UPDATE AREAS**

Scenario	Land Use				
	Commercial	Industrial	Open Space	Park	Public
1	967	632	219	409	935
2	903	606	141	416	786
3	982	996	205	357	982
Adopted	955	598	515	154	980
Existing	450	252	—	17	180
Preferred	914	796	227	458	860
Reduced	903	592	259	458	786

**TABLE 11-4**  
**RESIDENTIAL UNITS BY SCENARIO/  
ALTERNATIVE FOR THE UPDATE AREAS**

Scenario	Subarea			Total
	Montgomery	Otay Ranch	Urban Core	
1	7,679	11,658	17,090	36,427
2	8,400	15,585	15,664	39,649
3	8,997	8,805	16,178	33,980
Adopted	4,724	7,541	10,481	22,746
Existing	4,963	—	9,499	14,462
Preferred	8,174	14,241	16,756	39,322
Reduced	7,679	8,805	15,664	32,623

### 11.2.1 Land Use

Chapter 5 of the EIR identified significant land use impacts in the Northwest, Southwest, and East Planning Areas. In the Northwest and Southwest, community character impacts were identified because of the bulk and scale of buildings that could be placed adjacent to predominantly one-story residential neighborhoods. In the Southwest, impacts were identified within the West Fairfield District from the existing land use condition to the proposed, more intensive development adjacent to the wildlife refuge and, in the Montgomery Subarea, due to the conversion of land designated for open space to an industrial use as proposed by Scenarios 1, 2, and 3. In the East, impacts were identified resulting from Scenario 2 due to the proposed residential uses within the 1,000-foot buffer around Otay Landfill, redesignation of industrial land to residential uses, and removal of habitat within a portion of Wolf Canyon.

#### 11.2.1.1 Northwest

The Reduced Project Alternative reduces the intensity of housing, commercial, and industrial uses as well as increases open space and park uses over that of the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. This reduction decreases the intensity of land uses allowing for improved design features, integration of uses, and height/intensity objectives and policies to be met easier. Under the Reduced Project Alternative, individual projects could still be approved that affect the bulk and scale of buildings within the Urban Core. The reduction of over 1,300 dwelling units in the Urban Core would reduce the potential community character impacts relative to the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios; however, impacts remain significant and unmitigated because implementation of the objectives and policies require subsequent planning and design standards that are not available at this stage in the planning process. The current project is a General Plan Update and the development of design standards are a zoning and specific plan effort. Until future Specific Plans are developed and zoning specifications are implemented impacts remain significant.

#### 11.2.1.2 Southwest

In the Southwest, the Reduced Project Alternative reduces the intensity of housing, commercial, and industrial uses as well as increases open space and park uses over that of the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. This reduction in land uses allows for improved design features and better integration of varying uses. The reduction in the intensity of housing, commercial, and industrial uses in the Southwest would reduce the potential community character impacts relative to the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios; however, impacts remain significant and unmitigated because implementation of the objectives and policies require subsequent planning and design standards that are not available at this stage in the planning process. The current project is a General Plan Update and the development of design standards are a zoning and specific plan effort. Until future

Specific Plans are developed and zoning specifications are implemented impacts remain significant.

#### 11.2.1.3 East

Chapter 5 of this EIR identifies significant adverse effects upon the community character of the surrounding villages within the East Planning Area. In the East, the Reduced Project Alternative reduces the intensity of housing, commercial, and industrial uses as well as increases open space and park uses over that of the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. For these reasons, the reduction in the intensity in the East may lessen the potential community character impacts relative to the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios; however, impacts remain significant and unmitigated because implementation of the objectives and policies require subsequent planning and design standards that are not available at this stage in the planning process. The current project is a General Plan Update and the development of design standards are a zoning and specific plan effort. Until future Specific Plans are developed and zoning specifications are implemented impacts remain significant.

Additionally, significant unmitigated impacts were identified in the East Planning Area resulting from Scenario 2 due to the proposed residential uses within the 1,000-foot buffer around Otay Landfill, redesignation of industrial land to residential uses, and removal of habitat within a portion of Wolf Canyon. Significant unmitigated impacts were also identified for Scenario 3 resulting from proposed residential uses within the 1,000-foot landfill buffer. As with the Preferred Plan, the Reduced Project Alternative reduces the impacts represented by Scenario 2 and 3, but not to below a level of significance. The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the impacts represented by Scenario 2 and 3 because it does not place residential uses within the 1,000-foot buffer around the Otay Landfill, and would not remove habitat within a portion of Wolf Canyon.

### **11.2.2 Landform Alteration/Aesthetics**

Adoption of the Preferred Plan and all three Scenarios would result in substantial changes to landforms and visual quality throughout the General Plan area. Increased density within the Urban Core and Montgomery Subareas would result in increased building heights and mass. In the east, currently undeveloped areas characterized by mesas, canyons, and hills would be developed with urban uses. The General Plan Update objectives and policies reduce the impact to substantial changes to landforms and visual quality throughout the General Plan area but not to below a level of significance.

The Reduced Project Alternative does not reduce the footprint or location of development or change the nature of the projects that could be permitted within in the General Plan Area, however, the alternative would lessen the aesthetic effects relative to the Preferred Plan or any of the Scenarios because there are lower densities proposed with the Reduced Project

Alternative. As with the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios, the objectives and policies do not completely mitigate the impact because development standards have not been developed. The current project is a General Plan Update and the development of design standards are a zoning and specific plan effort. Until future Specific Plans are developed and zoning specifications are implemented impacts remain significant.

A significant landform impact was identified for the East Planning Area and mitigation was identified. Because the Reduced Project Alternative reduces density and not the footprint of potential development, this impact remains the same and the specified mitigation is still required (see Section 5.2.5.2). Implementation of mitigation measure 5.2-1 would reduce significant landform alteration and aesthetics impacts associated with the Reduced Project Alternative; however, the open, rolling hills would be permanently altered by development and the impact would remain significant and unmitigated.

### **11.2.3 Biological Resources**

The Preferred Plan and Scenarios 1 and 3 would not result in significant impacts to biological resources. Significant biological impacts were identified for Scenario 2 due to development proposed within Wolf Canyon. The Reduced Project Alternative's direct impacts to sensitive biological resources would be less than that proposed for Scenario 2 of the General Plan Update. This alternative would not develop within Wolf Canyon and would provide more parks and open space lands throughout the General Plan area. The Reduced Project Alternative would be required to comply with the Chula Vista MSCP Subarea Plan, which provides comprehensive long-term habitat conservation to address the needs of multiple species and the preservation of natural vegetation communities for lands within the city and sphere of influence boundaries. Regulations would be imposed to all future projects by state and federal resource agencies to provide additional assurances that impacts would not be significant. As with the Preferred Plan and Scenarios 1 and 3, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would not result in significant impacts to biological resources.

### **11.2.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources**

Impacts to cultural and paleontological resources were identified as significant impacts for the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. Because the Reduced Project Alternative has the same potential footprint as these options, the potential effect is the same. As with the proposed General Plan Update, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts related to cultural and paleontological resources. As with the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios, significant impacts to cultural resources could be mitigated to below a level of significance. Mitigation of impacts to cultural resources is presented in Section 5.4.5, and mitigation of impacts to paleontological resources is provided in Section 5.6.5.

### **11.2.5 Geology and Soils**

As with the proposed General Plan Update, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would not result in significant impacts related to geology and soils. As with the each of the Scenarios of the proposed General Plan Update, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative is self-mitigating as it pertains to geology and soils. While future development would be exposed to geological hazards associated with seismic events, liquefaction, and expansive soils, potential impacts resulting from geologic hazards would be reduced below a level of significance through conformance to General Plan Policies EE 14.1 through EE 14.5.

### **11.2.6 Water Resources and Water Quality**

The impacts to water quality would be reduced over that of the Preferred Plan and each of the scenarios with the Reduced Project Alternative due to an increase of open space and park uses and less impermeable surface area. As with the Preferred Plan, and each of the Scenarios, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would avoid significant impacts by complying with Policies EE 2.2 through EE 2.7 and Objectives PFS 1 and 2.

### **11.2.7 Transportation**

Because there would be less acres of commercial, residential, and industrial development under the Reduced Project Alternative and because there would be fewer residential units under this alternative, there would be less traffic generated. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in fewer trips generated than the Preferred Plan or any of the scenarios.

As stated in Appendix H of the Traffic Impact Report, the Reduced Project Alternative represents a 10 percent reduction in traffic on area roadways as compared to the Preferred Plan. The following segments would be significantly impacted under the Reduced Project Alternative:

- E Street, from Marina to I-5
- H Street, from Marina to I-5
- J Street, from Marina to I-5
- Main Street, from I-5 to Broadway
- Main Street, from Hilltop to I-805
- Marina Parkway, from E to J

- Hunte Parkway, from SR-125 to Eastlake

When compared to the Preferred Plan and all three Scenarios, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in impacts to fewer roadway segments. Impacts to seven segments, however, would remain significant. As with the Preferred Project and the Scenarios, implementation of the mitigation measures called for in Section 5.10.6 would lessen these impacts, but not to below a level of significance.

### **11.2.8 Air Quality**

The San Diego Air Basin is designated as federal non-attainment for Ozone and state non-attainment for PM 10, Ozone and PM 2.5 air quality standards. Development in accordance with the Reduced Project Alternative would, as with the Preferred Project and each of the Scenarios, add to Ozone precursors and particulates. While the reduced development would have a corresponding reduction in the potential for emissions under both the Preferred Plan and the Reduced Project Alternative, air quality impacts remains significant and unmitigated.

As with the proposed Preferred Plan and all three Scenarios, the Reduced Project Alternative is not consistent with the growth assumptions in the RAQS. This is a significant adverse impact until the SANDAG TCM Plan is revised. Because the RAQS is the strategy for avoiding cumulative air quality impacts, these effects are significant and unmitigated.

### **11.2.9 Noise**

As with the proposed General Plan Update, development of the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential to expose sensitive receivers to undesirable noise levels. Development would equate to the increase in allowable density along highways and major arterials, adjacent to rail, and within the airport influence area of Brown Field. Lessening the noise levels in these areas would require a lot-by-lot review of potential exterior use areas and an evaluation of the acoustical performance of each building exposed to the increase. The exterior analysis would assess the feasibility of reducing noise levels to outdoor use areas and the interior review would require consideration of the effectiveness of existing windows and doors, the adequacy of existing construction, and the need for retrofit. Since this level of analysis is infeasible at the General Plan stage, direct impacts remain significant and not mitigated under the Reduced Project Alternative.

### **11.2.10 Public Services and Utilities**

The Reduced Project Alternative would be required to comply with the policies and guidelines for the provision of public services and utilities in Chula Vista, and would, thereby, avoid significant adverse service and utility impacts to water facilities, wastewater, school service, libraries, police and fire protection, and park and recreation. While the Reduced Project Alternative would reduce demand for Public Services and Utilities



resources, as with the proposed Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios, development of the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts to water supply and energy supply because of the absence of long term supply contracts for water and energy. The required mitigation measures and the policies and guidelines for the provision of public services and utilities in Chula Vista identified for the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios would also be applicable to this alternative, however, because of the absence of long-term supply contracts for water and energy, the impact remains significant and unmitigated.

#### **11.2.11 Parks and Recreation**

The Reduced Project Alternative reduce impacts to parks and recreation because the alternative would allow for an increase of open space and park uses when compared to the Preferred Plan and each of the scenarios. As with the proposed General Plan Update, the Reduced Project Alternative would comply with the policies and guidelines for the development of parks in Chula Vista as well as the policies regarding the Chula Vista Greenbelt, trails, bicycle ways and pedestrian-oriented street corridors linking community parks to the greenbelt and provide guidance for development of park facilities. Implementation of these policies would ensure that any parks and recreation impacts would be below a level of significance.

### **11.3 Community Character Alternative**

The EIR identified potential adverse impacts to community character that could result from the adoption of the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. This impact would result from heights and mass of buildings throughout the General Plan area. This potential effect could also impact the historic character of Downtown on Third Avenue. While mitigation was identified for these impacts in the land use section of this EIR, an alternative was established that reduces these effects. The purpose of this alternative was to consider the potential to reduce community character effects resulting from increased height and mass of buildings throughout the General Plan area.

The Community Character Alternative is analyzed within this EIR as a means of reducing impacts associated with land use specifically community character, and visual resources. To reduce these impacts, this alternative would reduce the height of development throughout the General Plan area compared to the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. The proposed General Plan Update uses three basic categories of building heights, as follows:

- ❑ Low-rise: 1 to 3 stories
- ❑ Mid-rise: 4 to 7 stories
- ❑ High-rise: 8 or more stories

These height ranges identify the predominant building height intended for a particular area and are used throughout the General Plan area. This alternative reduces the designated building heights by one category level, except for the low-rise category, to achieve a reduction in building heights throughout the General Plan area. For instance, every area designated for High-rise would be reduced to Mid-rise, likewise the areas designated for Mid-rise would be reduced to Low-rise. Areas affected with the reduction from High-rise to Mid-rise include the H Street Focus Area, the E Street Visitor Focus Area, and the H Street Gateway Focus Area. Reductions from Mid-rise to Low-rise would occur in other areas of change throughout the Northwest and Southwest Planning Areas and the also the Eastern Urban Center of Otay Ranch. The reduction from Mid-rise to Low-rise effects areas throughout the General Plan area. Even though this alternative would reduce heights, density ranges as specified in the General Plan Update would remain the same. As a result, it is possible that the bulk of buildings constructed in conformance with this alternative might be greater and lot coverage might increase.

The Community Character Alternative assumes that the basic goals, objectives, and policies of the proposed General Plan Update would be adopted except those pertaining to building heights. While the reduction in mass and scale would not necessarily reduce the footprint of development, nor the extent to which an area is redeveloped, the reduction in mass and height makes it more likely that the current community character would be maintained.

### **11.3.1 Land Use**

This alternative would reduce the impacts to community character compared to the Preferred Plan or any of the Scenarios. The mass and heights of buildings in the area would decrease which would be more likely to maintain the current community character over the Preferred Plan or any of the Scenarios. The Community Character Alternative assumes that the basic goals, objectives, and policies of the proposed General Plan Update would be adopted except those pertaining to building heights.

The reduction from high-rise to mid-rise buildings would occur in the H Street Focus Area, the E Street Visitor Focus Area, and the H Street Gateway Focus Area. This reduction would reduce any adjacency impacts due to the placement of high-rise buildings next to existing single family, one-story residences. Reducing these building heights has the potential to retain the traditional character of the Downtown area and increase the compatibility with surrounding properties compared to the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. However, as with the Preferred Plan and the three Scenarios, impacts would remain significant because implementation of the objectives and policies require subsequent planning and design standards that are not available at this stage in the planning process. The current project is a General Plan Update and the development of design standards is a zoning and specific plan effort. Until future Specific Plans are developed and zoning specifications are implemented impacts remain significant.

### **11.3.2 Landform Alteration/Aesthetics**

Implementation of the Community Character Alternative would reduce the impacts related to Landform Alteration/Aesthetics compared to the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. This alternative would reduce the height of development throughout the General Plan area. This alternative would comply with the objectives and policies of the General Plan Update, which would be implemented as part of future development to reduce aesthetic impacts, however not to below a level of significance. The ultimate effect on these issues would be based largely on the design of the development ultimately approved for the area, therefore, impacts would remain significant because implementation of the objectives and policies require subsequent planning and design standards that are not available at this stage in the planning process. The current project is a General Plan Update and the development of design standards are a zoning and specific plan effort. Until future Specific Plans are developed and zoning specifications are implemented impacts remain significant. While the Community Character Alternative would reduce visual impacts through the lowering of building heights, lowering the heights could result in an increase in bulk and potentially the area of the lot that is covered by development.

### **11.3.3 Biological Resources**

The Community Character Alternative's direct impacts to sensitive biological resources would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update. As with the proposed project, this alternative would be required to comply with the Chula Vista MSCP Subarea Plan, which provides comprehensive long-term habitat conservation to address the needs of multiple species and the preservation of natural vegetation communities for lands within the city and sphere of influence boundaries. Regulations would be imposed to all future projects by state and federal resource agencies to provide additional assurances that impacts would not be significant. Similar to the Preferred Plan and Scenarios 1 and 3, implementation of the Community Character Alternative would not result in significant impacts to biological resources. Scenario 2 proposed to place residential development within Wolf Canyon, and to designate portions of the Otay Valley District in an area specified as Active Recreation for commercial and residential use. These uses are not compatible with the MSCP and the RMP. The Community Character Alternative is consistent with the MSCP or RMP, and, therefore, would not result in significant impacts to biological resources.

### **11.3.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources**

Implementation of the Community Character alternative would reduce the impacts to historic character of Downtown on Third Avenue compared to the Preferred Plan or any of the Scenarios. The reduction in scale of buildings near historic resources would lessen the potential for an adverse effect on the historic context. All other cultural resource impacts associated with the Community Character Alternative would be similar to impacts associated with the proposed project.

Paleontological impacts associated with the Community Character Alternative would be similar to impacts associated with the preferred project. Mitigation measures identified for the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios would also be applicable to this alternative and would reduce the impacts to below a level of significance.

Mitigation measures identified for the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios would also be applicable to this alternative. Compliance with the policies associated with Objectives LUT 12 and EE 9 and the Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 would reduce the impact to cultural resources resulting from the adoption of the Community Character alternative to below a level of significance.

### **11.3.5 Geology and Soils**

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar level of impact to geological and soils resources as the Proposed Project. Under this alternative, development would still occur throughout the General Plan area. Therefore, since development would still occur under this alternative, geological resources would still be impacted. The goals, objectives, and policies associated with geology and soils would also be applicable to this alternative, and would reduce the impact to below a level of significance.

### **11.3.6 Water Resources and Water Quality**

The impacts to water quality would be similar to that of the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios with implementation of the Community Character Alternative. This alternative would reduce the height and bulk of the building however, the footprint of impermeable surfaces would be similar to that of the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. As with the proposed project, adherence to water quality control measures required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City's SUSMP and JURMP would reduce the potential impacts to below a level of significance.

### **11.3.7 Transportation**

The decrease in height as specified in this alternative does not necessarily result in a decrease in density. As such it cannot be definitively stated that the community character alternative would reduce traffic impacts as compared to the Preferred Plan or Scenarios 1, 2, or 3. Therefore, it is assumed for the purposes of this analysis, the traffic impacts would not be reduced. Therefore, impacts from the Preferred Plan and all three Scenarios, and the Community Character Alternative would be significant. The required traffic mitigation measures would be the same for both the Community Character Alternative and the proposed General Plan Update. As with the Preferred Project and the Scenarios, implementation of the mitigation measures called for in Section 5.10.6 would lessen these impacts, but not to below a level of significance.

### **11.3.8 Air Quality**

Impacts to air quality are closely associated with the number and length of vehicle trips on area roadways, as well as the flow of traffic on those roads. As with transportation, the decrease in height as specified in this alternative does not necessarily result in a decrease in density, and as such, it cannot be assumed that it would reduce air quality impacts as compared to the Preferred Plan or Scenarios 1, 2, or 3. Therefore, it is assumed for the purposes of this analysis that because traffic impacts are not reduced, air quality impacts would also not be reduced. In addition, this alternative is not consistent with the goals and objectives of the RAQS. Similar to the proposed project, this is considered a significant adverse impact until the SANDAG TCM Plan is revised. Because the RAQS is the strategy for avoiding cumulative air quality impacts, these effects are considered significant and unmitigated.

### **11.3.9 Noise**

Without a reduction in traffic volumes, there would not be a reduction in noise resulting from traffic on area roadways. As such, the Community Character Alternative does not result in a reduced noise impact relative to the Preferred Plan or any of the Scenarios.

As with the proposed General Plan Update, a significant impact will occur to existing receivers adjacent to circulation element roadways where traffic volumes are projected to result in noise level increases of more than 3 decibels. Lessening the noise levels in these areas would require a lot-by-lot review of potential exterior use areas and an evaluation of the acoustical performance of each building exposed to the increase. The exterior analysis would assess the feasibility of reducing noise levels to outdoor use areas and the interior review would require consideration of the effectiveness of existing windows and doors, the adequacy of existing construction, and the need for retrofit. Since this level of analysis is infeasible at the General Plan stage, direct impacts remain significant and not mitigated under the Community Character Alternative.

### **11.3.10 Public Services and Utilities**

The EIR identified potential adverse impacts to public services and utilities that could result from the adoption of the Preferred Plan or any of the Scenarios. As noted above, the decrease in height as specified in this alternative does not necessarily result in a decrease in density. As such it cannot be definitively stated that the Community Character Alternative would reduce impacts to public services or utilities as compared to the Preferred Plan or Scenarios 1, 2, or 3. Therefore, it is assumed for the purposes of this analysis, the service and utilities impacts would not be reduced.

As with the proposed Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios, development of the Community Character Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts to water

supply and energy supply because of the absence of long-term supply contracts for water and energy. The required mitigation measures and the policies and guidelines for the provision of public services and utilities in Chula Vista identified for the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios would also be applicable to this alternative; however, because of the absence of long-term supply contracts for water and energy the impact remains significant and unmitigated.

### **11.3.11 Parks and Recreation**

The Community Character Alternative would have the same impacts to open space and park uses when compared to the Preferred Plan or any of the Scenarios. As with the proposed General Plan Update, this alternative would comply with the policies and guidelines for the development of parks in Chula Vista as well as the policies regarding the Chula Vista Greenbelt, trails, bicycle ways and pedestrian-oriented street corridors linking community parks to the greenbelt and provide guidance for development of park facilities. Implementation of these policies would ensure that any parks and recreation impacts would be below a level of significance.

## **11.4 Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative**

The EIR identified the potential for future development in accordance with the adoption of the Preferred Plan, or any of the Scenarios, would have a significant adverse impact to traffic. The purpose of the reduced traffic impact alternative was to avoid potential traffic effects by increasing the physical capacity of impacted roadways (Table 11-5). As a result of the traffic analysis in this EIR, 15 non-urban roadway segments were determined to have a significant impact with the adoption of the Preferred Plan. Scenario 1 would impact 18 segments, Scenario 2 would impact 18 segments, and Scenario 3 would impact 19 segments. The alternative does not affect the classification of the Urban Core roadways for the Preferred Plan and Scenario 3 because traffic on those street segments was not a significant adverse impact. Urban Core roadway segments on Broadway from C Street to E Street, and on E from Woodlawn to Broadway had significant impacts under Scenarios 1 and 2. The reduced Traffic Impact Alternative was developed to reduce these impacts. This alternative would upsize the classification of all roadways segments identified as being significantly impacted under the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios to reduce these impacts.

Table 11-5 shows the roadway segments that were determined to have a significant impact after mitigation with the adoption of the Preferred Plan or any of the Scenarios. This table also lists the roadway classifications proposed under the Preferred Plan and what classification the roadways were increased to under the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative. Upsizing the roadway segments would improve traffic flow and alleviate peak hour congestion.

**TABLE 11-5  
INCREASED ROADWAY CLASSIFICATION FOR THE REDUCED TRAFFIC IMPACT ALTERNATIVE**

Impacted Roadway Segment	GPU Classification	Plan/Scenario with Impact	Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative Classification
E Street from Marina Parkway to I-5	4-lane Major	All	6-Lane Major
E Street from Woodlawn to Broadway*	4-lane Urban Arterial	1	4-Lane Gateway
H Street from Marina Parkway to I-5	4-Lane Class I	All	6-Lane Major
J Street from Marina Parkway to I-5	4-Lane Major	All	6-Lane Prime
L Street from Hilltop to I-805	4-lane Class I	All	4-lane Major
Palomar Street from I-5 to Broadway	6-Lane Major	1, 2 and 3	6-Lane Prime
Main Street from I-5 to Broadway	4-lane Major	All	6-Lane Prime
Main Street from Broadway to Hilltop Dr.	4-lane Major	Preferred, 1 and 2	6-Lane Major
Main Street from Hilltop Dr. to I-805	4-lane Major	All	6-Lane Major
Main Street from I-805 to Heritage Road	6-Lane Prime	2 and 3	7-Lane Exp
Bonita Road from I-805 to Plaza Bonita Road	4-lane Major	All	6-lane Major
Bonita Road from Plaza Bonita Road to Willow	4-lane Major	1 and 3	6-lane Major
Bonita Road from Willow to Central	4-lane Major	All	6-lane Major
Telegraph Canyon Road from I-805 to Crest/Oleander	7-lane Exp	1, 2 and 3	8-lane Exp
Telegraph Canyon Road from Crest/Oleander to Paseo del Rey	6-lane Prime	All	8-lane Exp
Telegraph Canyon Road from Paseo del Rey to Paseo Ranchero	6-lane Prime	All	8-lane Exp
Otay Lakes Road from SR-125 to Eastlake Parkway	7-lane Exp	All	Not mitigable†
Otay Lakes Road from Eastlake Parkway to Lane Avenue	6-lane Prime	All	7-lane Exp
Olympic Parkway from I-805 to Oleander	6-lane Prime	All	7-lane Exp
Olympic Parkway from Oleander to Heritage	6-lane Prime	1 and 3	7-Lane Exp
Marina Parkway from E Street to J Street	4-Lane Major	All	6-Lane Major
Broadway from C Street to E Street*	4-Lane Commercial Boulevard	2	4-Lane Urban Arterial
Broadway between L Street and Palomar Street	4-Lane Major	1	6-Lane Major
Third Avenue from L Street to Palomar	4-Lane Class I	All	4-Lane Major
Third Avenue from Palomar to Main	4-Lane Class I	3	4-Lane Major
Paseo Ranchero from H to Telegraph Canyon	4-Lane Class I	1, 2 and 3	4-Lane Major
Eastlake Parkway from Hunte and Otay Valley	4-Lane Major	1 and 2	6-Lane Major
Lane Avenue from Proctor Valley to Otay Lakes	4-lane Class I	All	4-lane Major
Hunte Parkway from SR-125 to EastLake Parkway	6-lane Town Center Arterial	All	8-lane Exp

\*Roadway is a part of the Urban Core Circulation Element.

†There is no standard street classification in the City that can accommodate this volume with an acceptable LOS.

### **11.4.1 Land Use**

The Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative results in the same land use impacts as the Preferred Alternative and Scenario 1. It has fewer impacts than Scenarios 2 and 3 in that it avoids the effects resulting from placement of residential units adjacent to the Otay Landfill. The widening of the roads listed in Table 11.5 could significantly affect community character, particularly in the developed areas in western Chula Vista. The eastern roadways, including Otay Lakes Road, Olympic Parkway, and Eastlake Parkway, are large roadways and their widening would have less an effect on community character. Homes and businesses are at a greater distance from these streets than roads in older neighborhoods. As with the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios, land use impacts associated with community character would be significant and unmitigated as a result of the adoption of the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative.

### **11.4.2 Landform Alteration/Aesthetics**

Implementation of the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative would increase the significant impacts related to Landform Alteration/Aesthetics compared to the significant impacts identified for the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios because this alternative increases the roadway widths throughout the General Plan area. This would have an effect on the character in areas of the built environment and could substantially alter existing scenic resources. In open areas, there is the potential that future development of these increased road segments to impact important scenic resources. While this alternative would reduce traffic-related impacts it would increase impacts upon landform and aesthetics compared to the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios.

### **11.4.3 Biological Resources**

The Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative's will have a greater impact on sensitive biological resources than the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. The increase widths to roadway segments in the undeveloped portions in the East Planning area, particularly along Main Street and Olympic Parkway could increase the potential for an impact to biological resources compared to the Preferred Plan or any of the Scenarios. Additional lanes on roadways have increases in width. An average lane width is 12 feet, with corresponding additional improvements. By increasing a roadway by 12 to 24 feet, the potential for additional impacts is similarly increased.

### **11.4.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources**

Implementation of the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative will increase the impacts to Cultural and Paleontological Resources compared to the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. Mitigation measures identified for the Preferred Plan would also be applicable to this alternative. Compliance with the policies associated with Objectives LUT 12 and EE 9



and the Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 would reduce the impact to cultural resources resulting from the adoption of the Community Character alternative to below a level of significance.

#### **11.4.5 Geology and Soils**

Implementation of this alternative will have a greater impact on geological and soils resources than the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. Under this alternative, more impacts from the development of new roadways and improvements of existing roadways would occur throughout the General Plan area. Therefore, since development would still occur under this alternative, geological resources would still be impacted. The goals, objectives, and policies associated with geology and soils would also be applicable to this alternative, and would reduce the impact to below a level of significance.

#### **11.4.6 Water Resources and Water Quality**

The impacts to water quality will be greater than that of the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios with implementation of the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative. This alternative would increase the development footprint of the roadways which would increase impermeable surfaces over that of the Preferred Plan. As with the proposed project, adherence to water quality control measures required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City's SUSMP and JURMP would reduce the potential impacts to below a level of significance.

#### **11.4.7 Transportation**

The Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative would reduce the significant traffic impacts compared to the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. As stated above, 15 non-urban roadway segments were determined to have a significant impact after mitigation with the adoption of the Preferred Plan. Scenario 1 would impact 18 segments, Scenario 2 would impact 18 segments, and Scenario 3 would impact 19 segments. The Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative would upsize the classification of all roadways segments identified as being significantly impacted under the Preferred Plan and the three Scenarios to reduce these impacts. Increasing a four-lane major to a six-lane major results in an increase capacity of 10,000 ADT. It is anticipated that those roadways operating at LOS D under the Preferred Plan would operate at C or better under this alternative.

#### **11.4.8 Air Quality**

Development of the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative will result in a reduction of significant air quality impacts compared to the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. The Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative would increase the roadway widths of 29 street segments throughout the General Plan area. This would improve traffic flow and increase the speed. This improved flow would increase turbulence around the roadway and could result

in fewer hot spots than the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. All other air quality impacts associated with this alternative would be similar to impacts associated with the Proposed Project and each of the Scenarios. The region is in federal non-attainment for Ozone and state non-attainment for PM<sub>10</sub>, Ozone, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Population growth will have a corresponding increase in Ozone precursors and particulates, adding to the cumulative air quality problem. The Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative would, therefore, still represent a significant air quality impact.

This alternative is not consistent with the growth assumptions of the RAQS. Similar to the proposed project, this is considered a significant adverse impact until the SANDAG TCM Plan is revised. Because the RAQS is the strategy for avoiding cumulative air quality impacts, these effects are considered significant and unmitigated.

#### **11.4.9 Noise**

Development of the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative will have a greater impact on noise than the Preferred Plan and all three Scenarios. As stated above, this alternative would increase the roadway widths of 29 street segments throughout the General Plan area. This would increase the speed on those roadways. The increase in speed would have a corresponding increase in noise. Widening the roadway could, potentially, bring the noise source closer to a sensitive receiver as well. The Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative will have a greater impact on noise than the Preferred Plan and all three Scenarios, therefore, impacts remain significant and not mitigated under this alternative.

#### **11.4.10 Public Services and Utilities**

Development of the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative will result in similar impacts to Public Services and Utilities compared to the Preferred Plan and all three Scenarios. Thus, the significant water facilities and supply, sewer, wastewater, school service, police and fire protection, and park and recreation impacts identified for the proposed project would remain the same under this alternative. The mitigation measures and the policies and guidelines for the provision of public services and utilities in Chula Vista identified for the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios would also be applicable to this alternative.

As with the proposed Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios, development of the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts to water supply and energy supply because of the absence of long-term supply contracts for water and energy. The required mitigation measures and the policies and guidelines for the provision of public services and utilities in Chula Vista identified for the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios would also be applicable to this alternative, however, because of the absence of long-term supply contracts for water and energy the impact remains significant and unmitigated.

#### **11.4.11 Parks and Recreation**

The Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative would have the same impacts to open space and park uses when compared to the Preferred Plan and each of the Scenarios. As with the proposed General Plan Update, this alternative would comply with the policies and guidelines for the development of parks in Chula Vista as well as the policies regarding the Chula Vista Greenbelt, trails, bicycle ways and pedestrian-oriented street corridors linking community parks to the greenbelt and provide guidance for development of park facilities. Implementation of these policies would ensure that any parks and recreation impacts would be below a level of significance.